

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----X
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 CR 134 (SJ)

v.

ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

AVIGDOR GUTWEIN, YUDAH
NEUMAN, MOSES NEUMAN, and
LEO FEKETE,

Defendants.

-----X

A P P E A R A N C E S

LORETTA E. LYNCH
United States Attorney
Eastern District of New York
271 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, NY 11201
By: Charles Kleinberg
Attorneys for the Government

LAW OFFICE OF JACOB LAUFER
65 Broadway, Suite 1005
New York, NY 10006
By: Jacob Laufer
Attorney for Avigdor Gutwein

SPEARS & IMES LLP
51 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10010
By: David Spears
Michelle Skinner

Attorneys for Yudah Neuman

HAFETZ NECHELES & ROCCO

500 Fifth Avenue, Floor 29

New York, NY 10110

By: Susan R. Necheles

Joshua R. Geller

Attorneys for Moses Neuman

LAW OFFICES OF HARRY BATCHELDER, JR.

40 Wall Street, 28th Floor

New York, NY 10005

By: Harry Batchelder, Jr.

Attorney for Leo Fekete

JOHNSON, Senior District Judge:

Presently before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) prepared by Magistrate Judge Steven M. Gold. Judge Gold issued the Report on November 30, 2012, recommending that this Court deny various pretrial motions filed by defendants Avigdor Gutwein (“Gutwein”), Leo Fekete (“Fekete”), Yudah Neuman and Moses Neuman (collectively “Defendants”). Defendants Gutwein, Yudah Neuman and Moses Neuman subsequently pled guilty and are awaiting sentencing. Defendant Fekete did not file objections to the Report. For the reasons stated herein, this Court affirms and adopts the Report in its entirety.

A district court judge may designate a magistrate judge to hear and determine certain motions pending before the Court and to submit to the Court proposed findings of fact and a recommendation as to the disposition of the motion. See 28

U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 10 days of service of the recommendation, any party may file written objections to the magistrate's report. See id. Upon *de novo* review of those portions of the record to which objections were made, the district court judge may affirm or reject the recommendations. See id. The Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections may waive the right to appeal this Court's Order. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Small v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs., 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989).

In this case, Defendants filed no objections to the Report. Upon review of the recommendations, this Court adopts and affirms Magistrate Judge Gold's Report in its entirety.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 16, 2014
Brooklyn, NY

_____/s_____
Sterling Johnson, Jr., U.S.D.J.